

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are all the claims pending in the application.

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Chikaodili Anyikire for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the telephone interview conducted on November 19, 2010. During the interview, Applicants' representative explained why it is believed that the claims of the present application are patentable over the Park reference (US 6,690,374). In this regard, Applicants note that the arguments presented herein for distinguishing the claims over the Park reference correspond to the comments made during the interview.

Also, in view of the Examiner's comments during the interview, Applicants note that claims 1 and 11 have been amended in order to clarify that in the phrase "(ii) the perpendicular bisector and a boundary of the monitoring subject region", that "the perpendicular bisector" refers to "the perpendicular bisector of the line of segment connecting the first reference point provided within the imaging region to which the camera terminal belongs and the second reference point provided within the imaging region of another camera terminal adjoining to the imaging region to which the camera terminal belongs".

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Park et al. (US 6,690,374).

Claim 1 recites that said adjusting unit is operable to determine a region surrounding a first reference point as the monitoring responsible region, according to i) at least one perpendicular bisector of a line of segment connecting the first reference point provided within the imaging region to which the camera terminal belongs and a second reference point provided

within an imaging region of another camera terminal adjoining to the imaging region to which the camera terminal belongs or ii) the perpendicular bisector of the line of segment connecting the first reference point provided within the imaging region to which the camera terminal belongs and the second reference point provided within the imaging region of another camera terminal adjoining to the imaging region to which the camera terminal belongs and a boundary of the monitoring subject region.

As discussed during the interview, Applicants note that above-noted feature is depicted, for example, in Fig. 15 of the present application and is described, for example, in paragraph [0060] of the original specification. Applicants note that reference to any specific drawings or sections of the specification is provided only for illustrative purposes, and is not intended to otherwise limit the scope of the claims to any particular embodiments.

In this regard, as described in paragraph [0060] of the specification with reference to Fig. 15, it is indicated that “the camera terminal 110A draws a perpendicular bisector (dotted line) relative to a line of segment connecting the end of the line of sight by the other camera terminal selected in FIG. 14 (in other words, the second reference point) and the end of the line of sight by the camera terminal 110A itself (in other words, the first reference point), and determines a region determined by the perpendicular bisectors and/or the boundary of the monitoring subject region 130 surrounding the end of its own line of sight (the first reference point) as the monitoring responsible region 150A.”

Regarding the disclosure in Park, as discussed during the interview, while Fig. 6 of Park depicts multiple regions each having a camera located therein, whereby it can be determined when a boundary of a particular region has been crossed (e.g., see col. 4, line 64 through col. 5, line 16; and col. 6, lines 48-67), Applicants respectfully submit that that Park does not include

any description regarding the use of (i) at least one perpendicular bisector of a line of segment connecting a first reference point provided within the imaging region to which the camera terminal belongs and a second reference point provided within an imaging region of another camera terminal adjoining to the imaging region to which the camera terminal belongs, or ii) the perpendicular bisector of the line of segment connecting the first reference point provided within the imaging region to which the camera terminal belongs and the second reference point provided within the imaging region of another camera terminal adjoining to the imaging region to which the camera terminal belongs and a boundary of the monitoring subject region.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Park does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Park, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 3-8 and 10 depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 11, Applicants note that this claim recites that in said adjusting step, a region surrounding a first reference point is determined as the monitoring responsible region, according to i) at least one perpendicular bisector of a line of segment connecting the first reference point provided within the imaging region to which the camera terminal belongs and a second reference point provided within an imaging region of another camera terminal adjoining to the imaging region to which the camera terminal belongs or ii) the perpendicular bisector of the line of segment connecting the first reference point provided within the imaging region to which the camera terminal belongs and the second reference point provided within the imaging region of another camera terminal adjoining to the imaging region to which the camera terminal belongs and a boundary of the monitoring subject region.

For reasons at least similar to those as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Park does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature recited in amended claim 11. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 11 is patentable over Park, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claim 12 depends from claim 10 and is therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 2 and 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Atsushi YOSHIDA et al.

/Kenneth W. Fields/

By 2010.11.29 15:42:53 -05'00'

Kenneth W. Fields
Registration No. 52,430
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/krq
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 29, 2010